

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated December 27, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 27, 2008. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 2-8, 10, 11, 13-16, 19-25 and 28-38 are pending in the application. Claims 2-8, 10, 11, 13-16, 19-25 and 28-38 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 31, 33, 35, 37 have been amended as proposed in the interview with the examiners. Claims 13-16, 19-25 and 28-30 have been amended to depend from correct respective independent claims. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Interview Summary

On January 29, 2007, a telephonic interview was held between Gero G. McClellan (attorney of record) Patrick A. Darno (the assistant Examiner) and the Supervisory Examiner. The parties discussed the cited reference, *Dageville*. Claim 31 was discussed. The parties also discussed proposed amendments to Claim 31. The proposed amendments are reflected in this response.

During the interview, Applicants argued that scheduling options were not taught by the reference, specifically that scheduling options were not equivalent to *Dageville*'s query plans. However, the Examiners believed further clarification was needed in the claims. Accordingly, Applicants submitted proposed amendments for the Examiners' consideration. Subsequently, during a follow-up telephone conference, Examiner Darno agreed that the proposed amendments would overcome the present rejection. Accordingly, the agreed upon proposed amendments are presented herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-8, 10-11, 13-16, 19-25 and 28-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Dageville et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0125427, hereinafter, “*Dageville*”).

The rejections have been obviated by the amendments presented herein, following the agreement reached during the interview. Specifically, the claims now recite that a “larger set of scheduling options are stored on a computer readable storage medium and include a plurality of user-selectable time criteria and frequency criteria, wherein the time criteria specifies when the execution of a given unit of work will begin and the frequency criteria specifies how frequently the given unit of work will be executed; return the first set of user-selectable scheduling unit of work to the user interface for display, whereby the user interface presents: time criteria selection elements from which a user specifies a time at which execution of the first unit of work will begin; and frequency criteria selection elements from which the user specifies a frequency at which the first unit of work will be executed beginning at the specified time”. Such limitations are not taught by *Dageville*.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants